REMARKS

In the office action of March 28, 2006, the Examiner rejected claim 20, but allowed the other pending claims.

Applicant has amended claim 20 to require that the frame portion comprises a back, and that the back comprises mounting structures for mounting three dimensional objects. The prior art does not teach such mounting structures. As such, Applicant believes that the claim is in condition for allowance.

Applicant has added new claim 21 which further recites a flexible hinge portion connecting the frame to the binder portion. This is not found in the prior art.

Applicant has also added new independent claim 22 which requires the page device to have a binder portion for mounting the device into a binder and a frame portion which has a back and sides, and a front which is removably attached to the sides. The prior art teaches fronts which are permanently attached to the sides. Lee teaches a device where the front is permanently attached to the sides. Gunn teaches a front which is permanently attached but pivots open. Dependent claim 23 further requires that the front is held to the sides by screws. Such is not taught by the prior art. It is contrary to the teachings of Gunn to use screws to secure the front to the sides of the device as the front is hinged for frequent and easy access, and screws prevent this. Lee teaches a permanently attached front as mentioned, not one removably attached via screws.

Dependent claim 24 further requires that the binder portion have substantially the same thickness as the frame portion. Both Gunn and Lee teach binder mounting portions which are thin to allow for easy turning when mounted in a ring type binder. If the mounting portions were

BATEMAN IP LAW GROUP 8 EAST BROADWAY, SUITE 550 P.O. BOX 1319 SALT LAKE CITY, UTAH 84110 thicker, the devices would not turn easily like a page and their convenient use would thus be

hindered.

Dependent claim 25 further requires that the binder portion is attached to the frame via a

flexible hinge.

New independent claim 26 requires a frame with a back, sides, and front, and a binder

portion with has mounts having upper and lower openings, and where the distance between the

upper and lower openings is greater than the minimum width of the openings. The prior art

teaches thin mounting structures with mounts (holes) with the distance between the upper and

lower opening being much less than the dimension of the openings, as is convenient for use in a

ring style binder. As such, claim 26 is patentable over the prior art.

Dependent claim 27 is independently patentable as it further requires that the binder

portion is substantially the same thickness as the frame portion. As discussed, this is not taught

in the prior art. The prior art would not be modified to include such as it would hinder the

functionality of the prior art by making it more difficult to fit into a binder and to turn the page.

Dependent claim 28 requires that each of the mounts comprise a continuous channel.

The prior art does not show mounting channels of the claimed dimensions.

Dependent claim 29 is independently patentable as it requires a flexible hinge between

the frame and the binder portion.

Dependent claim 30 is also patentable as it requires that the back have mounting

structures not taught by the prior art.

Applicant therefore believes that the application is in condition for allowance. Applicant

has included a credit card authorization in the amount of \$200 to cover the two additional

9

independent claims. The total number of claims is now 20, and as such no other claim fees are required.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized during the entire pendency of this application to credit any overpayment and debit any amount owing, including fees for extensions of time, to Deposit Account No. 50-2720.

Sincerely,

BATEMAN IP LAW GROUP

Randall B. Bateman Reg. No. 37,774

8 East Broadway, Suite 550

P.O. Box 1319

Salt Lake City, UT 84110

Tel. (801) 533-0320 Fax. (801) 533-0323

E-mail: rbb@utah-ip.com

RBB:bhp